

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 1, 7 and 9-11 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that each longitudinal knife has a cross section smaller than the size of each opening. Claim 7 has been amended to recite that the cross section of each opening in the transverse knives is larger than the cross section of each longitudinal knife. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, in column 4, lines 12-16, and Figures 8 and 10. (It is respectfully submitted that the word "Mach" in column 4, line 12 is clearly a typographical error in U.S. Patent 6,367,375, which has been corrected by this Amendment to correctly read as "Each".)

Claim 7, line 6, has also been amended to delete the article "the" prior to the recitation of "longitudinal knives" as it is the first recitation of the longitudinal knives. The following recitations of the longitudinal knives thus have proper antecedent basis.

Claim 9 has been amended to recite that the cross section of each opening in the longitudinal knives is greater than the cross section of the pin. The term "sufficiently" has been deleted from the claim. Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in column 5, lines 18-22. Claim 9 is also discussed in more detail below.

Claim 10, line 6, has been amended in the same manner as claim 7, line 6, i.e. the article "the" has been deleted.

Claim 11 has been amended in a manner similar to claims 1 and 7, i.e. to recite that each opening (in the transverse knives) has a size greater than the cross section of each longitudinal knife. Support for the amendment is similar to that discussed above for claims 1 and 7.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments discussed above, and in more detail below, overcome the sole remaining rejection, and place the application in condition for allowance. It is further respectfully submitted that the amendments would not require any further consideration and/or search. Entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 1st paragraph. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

MPEP § 2164 states: The examiner has the initial burden of presenting by a preponderance of evidence why a person skilled in the art would not recognize in an applicant's disclosure a description of the invention defined by the claims.

MPEP § 2163.02 states: [T]o satisfy the written description requirement, an applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention, and that the invention, in that context, is whatever is now claimed. The test for sufficiency of support in a parent application is whether the disclosure of the application relied upon reasonably conveys to the artisan that the inventor had possession at that time of the later claimed subject matter.

MPEP § 2163.02 further states: An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using

such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action fails to meet its initial burden of presenting reasons why one of ordinary skill in the art would not recognize in the disclosure a description of the invention defined by the claims. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants have shown possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention in the application as originally filed, including the specification and drawings.

With respect to the recitation in claim 1 that each longitudinal knives possesses a smaller cross section than the size of each opening, Figures 8 and 10, at least, clearly show this feature. Furthermore, as disclosed in column 4, lines 60-64, a series of opposing recesses 39, 40 are provided in each transverse knife 32 that can jointly receive a longitudinal knife 38. As even further disclosed, in column 4, lines 65-67, the longitudinal knife 38 has some possibility of movement within the opening 39, 40.

It is respectfully submitted that the disclosure discussed above, at least, reasonably conveys to one of ordinary skill in the art that Applicants were in possession of the invention of claim 1.

With respect to claim 7, it is respectfully submitted that the Applicants' possession of the claimed feature of each opening being larger than the cross section of each longitudinal knife is reasonably conveyed to one of ordinary skill for, at least, the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

The recitation in claim 7 of a means for preventing the longitudinal knives from longitudinal movement relative to the transverse knives is clearly supported, for

example, in Figures 6, 7 and 9, and in column 5, lines 21-23. As clearly shown in Figures 6, 7 and 9, the pin 46 passes through the openings 45 in the frame girders 30, 31 and through the openings 44 in the longitudinal knives 38. The insertion of the pin 46 through the longitudinal knives 38, and the pin's securement to the girders 30, 31 by the bent ends 47, clearly prevents the longitudinal knives 38 from moving longitudinally relative to the transverse knives 32. The insertion of the longitudinal knives 38 through the openings 39, 40 in the transverse knives 32, and the subsequent insertion of the pin 46 through the openings 45 in the girders 30, 31 and the openings 44 in the longitudinal knives 38 enables the longitudinal knives 38 to be received and locked against lateral displacement, as disclosed in column 4, lines 58-59. See, also, column 5, lines 66 through column 6, line 4, for alternative configurations of the pin.

As another example, Figures 14, 15 and 16, 17 and column 6, lines 8-45, disclose two other methods for fixing the longitudinal knives to the transverse knives so as to prevent relative movement.

With respect to claim 9, Figure 9 and column 5, lines 24-27, clearly disclose that the cross section of each opening 44 in the longitudinal knives 38 is greater than the cross section of the pin 46. Figure 9 clearly shows a space between the pin 46 and the opening 44 in the longitudinal knife. The lead line from reference number 44 in Figure 9 clearly ends at such a space.

The means for securing the longitudinal knives from longitudinal displacement relative to the transverse knives of claim 10 is clearly supported by, for example, the pin 46 and the two embodiments shown in Figures 14, 15 and 16, 17, as discussed above with respect to claim 7.

The means for securing the transverse knives to the girders recited in claim 12 is clearly supported, for example, by Figure 8 and column 4, lines 8-9, which disclose that the transverse knife may be secured by welds.

Column 4, lines 12-15, clearly discloses that each opening of a transverse knife is in register (i.e. alignment) with corresponding opening of the other transverse knives, and the openings are designed so that a longitudinal knife can be slid into them. Column 5, lines 11-14, clearly discloses that a long leg of a U-shaped longitudinal knife inserted from one side comes to lie in line with a short leg of a U-shaped longitudinal knife inserted from the other side (i.e. the longitudinal knives are arranged in pairs). See, also, Figure 6, which clearly shows the arrangement of the longitudinal knives 38 in pairs.

It is respectfully submitted that application as originally filed clearly conveys to one of ordinary skill that Applicants were in possession of the invention of claim 12.

It is respectfully noted that claim 12 does not recite an extension element as stated in the Office Action. However, the part joining pairs of the longitudinal knives is clearly supported, for example, by the pin 46 and its alternative configurations as discussed above, and the embodiments shown in Figures 14, 15 and 16, 17 and described in column 6, lines 5-45.

Claims 18 and 19 are clearly supported, for example, by column 6, lines 18-20, and Figures 16 and 17.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph are respectfully requested.

It is believed that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: November 20, 2006

By: _____


Matthew L. Schneider
Registration No. 32,814

John P. Darling
Registration No. 44,482

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620